arXiv:1603.05791v1 [math.PR] 18 Mar 2016

Number of claims and ruin time for a refracted risk process

Yanhong Li* Chunming Zhao† Chunsheng Zhang‡ Zbigniew Palmowski §

March 21, 2016

Abstract

In this paper, we consider a classical risk model refracted at given level. We give an explicit expression for the joint density of the ruin time and the cumulative number of claims counted up to ruin time. The proof is based on solving some integro-differential equations and employing the Lagrange's Expansion Theorem.

Keywords: threshold dividend strategy, ruin time, number of claims, refracted risk process.

1 Introduction

The joint density of the ruin time and the numbers of claims counted until ruin time has been already studied for a classical risk process over last years. Dickson [3] derived special expression for it using probabilistic arguments. Landriault et al. [11] analyzed this object for the Sparre Andersen risk model with the exponential claims. Later Frostig et al. [6] generalized it to the case of a renewal risk model with the phase-type claims and inter-arrival times. The main tool used there was the duality between the risk model and a workload of a single server queueing model. Zhao and Zhang [18] considered a delayed renewal risk model, where the claim size is Erlang(n) distributed and the inter-arrival time is assumed to be infinitely divisible.

Our goal is to derive expression for the joint density of the ruin time and the numbers of claims counted until ruin time for a refracted classical risk process (see Kyrianou and Loeffen [9] for a formal definition). The latter process is a classical risk process whose dynamics change by subtracting off a fixed linear drift whenever the cumulative risk process is above a pre-specified level b. This subtracting of the linear drift corresponds to the dividend payments and the considered strategy is also known as a threshold strategy. Dividend strategies for insurance risk models were first proposed by De Finetti [2] to reflect more realistically the surplus cash flows in an insurance portfolio. Later a vast literature

*School of mathematical Sciences and LPMC Nankai University, Tianjin 300071, P.R. China. Email: yanhongli@mail.nankai.edu.cn

†Department of Statistics School of Mathematics Southwest Jiaotong University, Chengdu, Sichuan, 611756, PR of China. Email:cmzhao@swjtu.cn

‡School of mathematical Sciences and LPMC Nankai University, Tianjin 300071, P.R. China. Email: zhangcs@nankai.edu.cn

§Mathematical Institute, University of Wroclaw, Poland. Email: zbigniew.palmowski@gmail.com

consider this model, in particular the threshold strategy was considered in Lin and Pavlova [14], Zhu and Yang [20], Lu and Li [16], Badescu, Drekic and Landriault [1], Gao and Yin [7] and references therein. The case when the drift of the refracted process is disappearing (everything above threshold b is paid as dividends) is called barrier strategy; see Lin et al. [15], Li and Garrido [12], Zhou [19] and in the references therein.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we define the model we deal with in this paper. In Section 3 we recall properties of the translation operator and the root of the Lundberg fundamental equation. In particular, we introduced the Lagrange's expansion theorem and some notations. In Section 4 we construct two integro-differential equations identifying the joint Laplace transform of joint density of the numbers of claims counted up to ruin time and the ruin time. Analytical solutions of these two integro-differential equations are given in Section 5. Applying the Lagrange's expansion theorem in Section 6 we give the expression for above mentioned density.

2 Model

The classical risk process is given by

$$U(t) = c_1 t - S(t), \qquad U(0) = u, \tag{1}$$

where u denotes initial capital, c is the premium rate and $S(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_t} X_i$ represents the total amount of claims appeared up to time t. That is, $\{X_i\}$ are non-negative i.i.d. random variables with pdf $f(x)$ and cdf $F(x)$ and $\{N_t\}$ is an independent Poisson process with a parameter λ. To take into account dividend payments paid when regulated process (after deduction of dividends) is above fixed threshold level $b > 0$, we consider so-called refracted process given formally for $c_2 < c_1$ by:

$$dU_b(t) = \begin{cases} c_1 dt - dS(t), & 0 \le U_b(t) \le b \\ c_2 dt - dS(t), & U_b(t) > b \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

and $U_b(0) = u$. In this case $c_1 - c_2$ denotes intensity of dividend payments, see Figure 1.



Figure 1 : Graphical representation of the surplus process $U_b(t)$.

We will assume throughout of this paper that $c_2 > \lambda E X_1$, that is refracted process $U_b(t)$ tends to infinity almost surely. We can then consider the ruin time:

$$\tau = \inf\{t > 0, U_b(t) < 0\}.$$

Note that N_τ represents the number of claims counted until the ruin time. The main goal of this paper is identification of the density of (τ, N_τ). We start from analyzing its Laplace transform:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(u) &= E[r^{N_\tau} e^{-\delta\tau} \mathbb{I}(\tau < \infty) | U_b(0) = u] && (3) \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} r^n \int_0^\infty e^{-\delta t} w(u, n, t) dt, && (4) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$w(u, n, t) = P(N_\tau = n, \tau \in dt | U_b(0) = u)/dt$$

is the joint density of (τ, N_τ) when $U_b(0) = u$. In above definition we have $\delta > 0$ and $r \in (0, 1]$. Later we will use also the following notations

$$w_1(u, n, t) = w(u, n, t) \qquad \text{for } u \leq b \tag{5}$$

and

$$w_2(u, n, t) = w(u, n, t) \qquad \text{for } u > b. \tag{6}$$

3 Preliminaries

In this section we introduce few facts used further in this paper. We start from recalling the translation operator T_s; see Dickson and Hipp [4]. For any integrable real-valued function f it is



Figure 2: Roots for Lundberg's fundamental equation.

defined as

$$T_s f(x) = \int_x^\infty e^{-s(y-x)} f(y) dy, \quad x \geq 0.$$

The operator T_s satisfies the following properties:

1. $T_s f(0) = \int_0^\infty e^{-sx} f(x) dx = \hat{f}(s)$ which is the Laplcae transform of f;
2. The operator T_s is commutative, i.e. $T_s T_r = T_r T_s$. Moreover, for $s \neq r$ and $x \geq 0$

$$T_s T_r f(x) = T_r T_s f(x) = \frac{T_s f(x) - T_r f(x)}{r - s}. \tag{7}$$

More properties of the translation operator T_s can be found in Li and Garrido [13] and Gerber and Shiu [8].

For any function g we will denote by $\hat{g}(s)$ its Laplace Transform, that is $\hat{g}(s) = \int_0^\infty e^{-sx} g(x)\, dx$. Next, for $i = 1, 2$ let ρ_i be the positive root of the Lundberg fundamental equation

$$c_i s - (\lambda + \delta) + \lambda r \hat{f}(s) = 0. \tag{8}$$

The positive roots always exists for $\delta > 0$; see Figure 2.

Lagrange's Expansion Theorem. In this paper we will also use the Lagrange's Expansion Theorem; see pages 251-326 of Lagrange [10]. Given two functions $\alpha(z)$ and $\beta(z)$ which are both analytic on and inside a contour D surrounding a point a, if r satisfies the inequality

$$|r\beta(z)| < |z - a|, \tag{9}$$

for every z on the perimeter of D, then $z - a - r\varphi(z)$, as a function of z, has exactly one zero η in the interior of D, and we further have:

$$\alpha(\eta) = \alpha(a) + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{r^k}{k!} \frac{d^{k-1}}{dx^{k-1}} \left(\alpha'(x)\beta^k(x)\right)\Big|_{x=a}. \tag{10}$$

Finally, we define also the impulse function

$$\delta_x(t) = \begin{cases} 0, & t \neq x \\ \infty, & t = x \end{cases}$$

with $\int_0^\infty \delta_x(t)dt = 1$. We denote $g^{k*}, k \geq 0$, with $g^{1*} = g$ and $g^{0*}(t) = \delta_0(t)$ the k-fold convolution of g with itself, where

$$(g * h)(t) = \int_0^t g(x)h(t-x)dx, \quad t \geq 0$$

for two functions g and h supported on $(0, \infty)$.

4 Integro-differential equations for the joint Laplace transform

In this section, we derive two integro-differential equations identifying $\phi(u)$ defined in (3). We will follow the idea given in Lin and Pavlova [14]. Denote

$$\phi(u) = \begin{cases} \phi_1(u), & u \leq b, \\ \phi_2(u), & u > b. \end{cases} \tag{11}$$

Theorem 4.1 *The joint Laplace transform ϕ satisfies the following integro-differential equations:*

$$\begin{cases} \phi_1'(u) = \frac{\lambda+\delta}{c_1}\phi_1(u) - \frac{\lambda r}{c_1}\int_0^u \phi_1(u-x)f(x)dx - \frac{\lambda r}{c_1}\bar{F}(u), & 0 \leq u \leq b \\ \phi_2'(u) = \frac{\lambda+\delta}{c_2}\phi_2(u) - \frac{\lambda r}{c_2}\left(\int_0^{u-b} \phi_2(u-x)f(x)dx + \int_{u-b}^u \phi_1(u-x)f(x)dx\right) - \frac{\lambda r}{c_2}\bar{F}(u), & u > b \end{cases} \tag{12}$$

with the boundary condition

$$\phi_1(b) = \phi_2(b) := \lim_{u \to b^+} \phi_2(u). \tag{13}$$

Remark 4.2 Note that from the integro-differential equations (12) follows that the joint Laplace transform with initial surplus above the barrier depends on the respective function with initial surplus below the barrier, but the reverse relationship does not hold true.

Proof. Let first $0 \leq u \leq b$. Then conditioning on the occurrence of the first claim we will have two cases: the first claim occurs before the surplus has reached the barrier level b or it occurs after reaching this barrier. There are also two other cases at the moment of the arrival of the first claim: either the risk process starts all over again with new initial surplus or the first claim leads already to ruin. Hence:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(u) &= \phi_1(u) \\ &= \int_0^{\frac{b-u}{c_1}} \lambda r e^{-\lambda t} e^{-\delta t} \left(\int_0^{u+c_1 t} \phi(u + c_1 t - x) f(x)dx + \bar{F}(u + c_1 t) \right) dt \\ &\quad + \int_{\frac{b-u}{c_1}}^\infty \lambda r e^{-\lambda t} e^{-\delta t} \left(\int_0^{b+c_2(t-\frac{b-u}{c_1})} \phi(b + c_2(t - \frac{b-u}{c_1}) - x) f(x)dx + \bar{F}(b + c_2(t - \frac{b-u}{c_1})) \right) dt \end{aligned}$$

$$= \lambda r \int_0^{\frac{b-u}{c_1}} e^{-(\lambda+\delta)t}\gamma(u+c_1t)dt + \lambda r \int_{\frac{b-u}{c_1}}^{\infty} e^{-(\lambda+\delta)t}\gamma(b+c_2(t-\frac{b-u}{c_1})dt, \tag{14}$$

where $\gamma(t) = \int_0^t \phi(t-x)f(x)dx + \bar{F}(t)$.
Changing variables in (14) and rearranging leads to the following equation for $0 \le u \le b$:

$$\phi_1(u) = \frac{\lambda r}{c_1} e^{(\lambda+\delta)u/c_1} \int_u^b e^{-(\lambda+\delta)t/c_1}\gamma(t)dt + \frac{\lambda r}{c_2} e^{(\lambda+\delta)u/c_1} \int_b^{\infty} e^{-(\lambda+\delta)[t-(c_1-c_2)b/c_1]/c_2}\gamma(t)dt. \tag{15}$$

Differentiating both sides of (15) with respect to u yields first equation.

Similarly, for $u > b$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi(u) &= \phi_2(u) \\
&= \int_0^{\infty} \lambda r e^{-\lambda t} e^{-\delta t} \left(\int_0^{u+c_2t} \phi(u+c_2t-x)f(x)dx + \bar{F}(u+c_2t) \right) dt \\
&= \lambda r \int_0^{\infty} e^{-(\lambda+\delta)t}\gamma(u+c_2t)dt \\
&= \frac{\lambda r}{c_2} e^{(\lambda+\delta)u/c_2} \int_u^{\infty} e^{-(\lambda+\delta)t/c_2}\gamma(t)dt.
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Differentiating both sides of (16) with respect to u produces the second equation.

Note also that from equations (15) and (16) it follows that $\phi(u)$ is continuous at $u = b$ and hence (13) holds. This completes the proof. □

5 The analytical expression for $\phi(u)$

In this section, we derive the analytical expression for $\phi_i(u)$ $(i1, 2)$ using the translation operator introduced in Section 3.

Theorem 5.1 *The function $\phi_2(u)$ can be expressed analytically as follows:*

$$\phi_2(u) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\lambda r}{c_2} \right)^{n+1} (T_{\rho_2} f)^{n*} * h(u-b), \qquad u > b, \tag{17}$$

where

$$h(u) := \int_u^{u+b} \phi_1(u+b-x) T_{\rho_2} f(x)dx + T_{\rho_2}\bar{F}(u+b). \tag{18}$$

Proof. We adopt the approach of Willmot and Dickson [17]. Consider the second equation in (12) for $u > b$. For a fixed $s > 0$, we multiply both sides of this equation by $e^{-s(u-b)}$ and integrate it with respect to u from b to ∞:

$$\begin{aligned}
c_2 \int_b^{\infty} e^{-s(u-b)}\phi_2'(u)du &= (\lambda+\delta)T_s\phi_2(b) - \lambda r \int_b^{\infty} e^{-s(u-b)} \int_0^{u-b} \phi_2(u-x)f(x)dxdu \\
&\quad -\lambda r \int_b^{\infty} e^{-s(u-b)} \int_0^b \phi_1(y)f(u-y)dydu - \lambda r T_s\bar{F}(b)
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= (\lambda+\delta)T_s\phi_2(b) - \lambda r\int_0^\infty e^{-sx}f(x)\int_{x+b}^\infty e^{-s(u-x-b)}\phi_2(u-x)dudx \\
&\quad -\lambda r\int_0^b \phi_1(y)\int_b^\infty e^{-s(u-b)}f(u-y)dudy - \lambda r T_s\bar{F}(b) \\
&= (\lambda+\delta)T_s\phi_2(b) - \lambda r\hat{f}(s)T_s\phi_2(b) - \lambda r\int_0^b \phi_1(y)T_s f(b-y)dy - \lambda r T_s\bar{F}(b).
\end{aligned}
$$

Integrating by parts gives:

$$
c_2\int_b^\infty e^{-s(u-b)}\phi_2'(u)du = c_2 sT_s\phi_2(b) - c_2\phi_2(b).
$$

Hence

$$
c_2 sT_s\phi_2(b) - c_2\phi_2(b) = (\lambda+\delta)T_s\phi_2(b) - \lambda r\hat{f}(s)T_s\phi_2(b) - \lambda r\int_0^b \phi_1(y)T_s f(b-y)dy - \lambda r T_s\bar{F}(b)
$$

and simple rearranging leads to:

$$
(c_2 s - (\lambda+\delta) + \lambda r\hat{f}(s))T_s\phi_2(b) = c_2\phi_2(b) - \lambda r\int_0^b \phi_1(y)T_s f(b-y)dy - \lambda r T_s\bar{F}(b). \tag{19}
$$

Taking $s=\rho_2$ for the solution ρ_2 of the Lundberg Fundamental Equation (8) gives

$$
c_2\phi_2(b) = \lambda r\int_0^b \phi_1(y)T_{\rho_2}f(b-y)dy + \lambda r T_{\rho_2}\bar{F}(b).
$$

Then equation (19) is equivalent to the following one:

$$
[c_2(s-\rho_2)+\lambda r\hat{f}(s)-\lambda r\hat{f}(\rho_2)]T_s\phi_2(b) = \lambda r\int_0^b \phi_1(y)[T_{\rho_2}f(b-y)-T_s f(b-y)]dy + \lambda r[T_{\rho_2}\bar{F}(b)-T_s\bar{F}(b)].
$$

Now dividing above equation by $s-\rho_2$ and using property 2 of the translation operator introduced in Section 2 produces:

$$
c_2 T_s\phi_2(b) = \lambda r T_s T_{\rho_2}f(0)T_s\phi_2(b) + \lambda r\int_0^b \phi_1(y)T_s T_{\rho_2}f(b-y)dy + \lambda r T_s T_{\rho_2}\bar{F}(b). \tag{20}
$$

Inverting the translation operators of (20) yields the following renewal equation for $\phi_2(u)$:

$$
\phi_2(u) = \frac{\lambda r}{c_2}\left[\int_0^{u-b}\phi_2(u-x)T_{\rho_2}f(x)dx + \int_{u-b}^u \phi_1(u-x)T_{\rho_2}f(x)dx + T_{\rho_2}\bar{F}(u)\right]. \tag{21}
$$

Taking $y=u-b$ and $g(y)=\phi_2(y+b)$ we can rewrite (21) as follows:

$$
g(y) = \frac{\lambda r}{c_2}\int_0^y g(y-x)T_{\rho_2}f(x)dx + \frac{\lambda r}{c_2}h(y), \qquad y>0,
$$

where

$$
h(y) = h(u-b) = \int_{u-b}^u \phi_1(u-x)T_{\rho_2}f(x)dx + T_{\rho_2}\bar{F}(u), \quad u>b.
$$

Hence

$$
\phi_2(u) \;=\; g(y)
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{\lambda r}{c_2}\int_0^y g(y-x)T_{\rho_2}f(x)dx + \frac{\lambda r}{c_2}h(y)\\
&= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\left(\frac{\lambda r}{c_2}\right)^{n+1}(T_{\rho_2}f)^{n*} * h(y)\\
&= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\left(\frac{\lambda r}{c_2}\right)^{n+1}(T_{\rho_2}f)^{n*} * h(u-b)
\end{aligned}
$$

which completes the proof. □

The expression for $\phi_1(u)$ could be also derived in terms of the translation operator.

Theorem 5.2 *The function $\phi_1(u)$ can be expressed analytically in the following form:*

$$\phi_1(u) = \phi_\infty(u) + \frac{\frac{\lambda r}{c_2}\left[\phi_\infty * T_{\rho_2}f(b) + T_{\rho_2}\bar{F}(b)\right] - \phi_\infty(b)}{\nu(b) - \frac{\lambda r}{c_2}\nu * T_{\rho_2}f(b)}\nu(u). \tag{22}$$

where

$$\phi_\infty(u) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\left(\frac{\lambda r}{c_1}\right)^{n+1}(T_{\rho_1}f)^{n*} * T_{\rho_1}\bar{F}(u) \tag{23}$$

and

$$\nu(x) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\left(\frac{\lambda r}{c_1}\right)^{n}(T_{\rho_1}f)^{n*} * p(x) \tag{24}$$

for $p(x) = e^{\rho_1 x}$.

Proof. Note that the first equation in (12) does not involve the barrier level b:

$$\phi_1'(u) = \frac{\lambda+\delta}{c_1}\phi_1(u) - \frac{\lambda r}{c_1}\int_0^u \phi_1(u-x)f(x)dx - \frac{\lambda r}{c_1}\bar{F}(u). \tag{25}$$

The information about the barrier b is included in the boundary condition:

$$\phi_1(b) = \phi_2(b) := \lim_{u\to b^+}\phi_2(u).$$

Lin et al. [14] showed that the general solution of (25) is of the form

$$\phi_1(u) = \phi_\infty(u) + k\nu(u), \tag{26}$$

where $\phi_\infty(u)$ is the joint Laplace transform of density of the ruin time and number of claims counted up to ruin time for the classical risk process (1) without any barrier applied. That is,

$$\phi_\infty(u) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} r^n \int_0^\infty e^{-\delta t} w_\infty(u,n,t)dt \tag{27}$$

for

$$w_\infty(u,n,t) := P(N_\tau = n, \tau \in dt | U(0) = u)/dt. \tag{28}$$

In above equation (26) the quantity k is a constant which we can specify by implementing (26) and (21):

$$k = \frac{\frac{\lambda r}{c_2}\left[\int_0^b \phi_\infty(b-x)T_{\rho_2}f(x)dx + T_{\rho_2}\bar{F}(b)\right] - \phi_\infty(b)}{\nu(b) - \frac{\lambda r}{c_2}\int_0^b \nu(b-x)T_{\rho_2}f(x)dx}. \tag{29}$$

We express now the function ϕ_∞ in terms of a compound geometric distribution. Indeed, since ϕ_∞ also satisfies equation (25), taking Laplace transforms of its both sides for sufficiently large s gives:

$$(c_1 s - (\lambda + \delta) + \lambda r \hat{f}(s))\hat{\phi}_\infty(s) = c_1\phi_\infty(0) - \lambda r \hat{\bar{F}}(s), \ s \geq 0. \tag{30}$$

To determine the constant term $c_1\phi_\infty(0)$ in (30), we substitute the solution ρ_1 of the Lundberg Fundamental Equation (8) for s:

$$c_1\phi_\infty(0) = \lambda r \hat{\bar{F}}(\rho_1) = \lambda r T_{\rho_1}\hat{\bar{F}}(0). \tag{31}$$

Consequently, the equation (30) reduces to

$$[c_1(s - \rho_1) + \lambda r \hat{f}(s) - \lambda r \hat{f}(\rho_1)]\hat{\phi}_\infty(s) = \lambda r \hat{\bar{F}}(\rho_1) - \lambda r \hat{\bar{F}}(s).$$

Dividing above equation by $s - \rho_1$ and simple rearranging along with implementation of the formula (7) produces:

$$c_1\hat{\phi}_\infty(s) = \lambda r \hat{\phi}_\infty(s) T_s T_{\rho_1} f(0) + \lambda r T_s T_{\rho_1}\bar{F}(0).$$

Inverting this Laplace transforms gives classical renewal equation:

$$\phi_\infty(u) = \frac{\lambda r}{c_1}\phi_\infty * T_{\rho_1} f(u) + \frac{\lambda r}{c_1} T_{\rho_1}\bar{F}(u) \tag{32}$$

having the solution given as an Neumann infinite series (23).

To prove the last statement (24) note that the function $\nu(u)$ satisfies the following integro-differential equation:

$$c_1\nu^{'}(u) - (\lambda + \delta)\nu(u) + \lambda r \int_0^u \nu(u - x) f(x) dx = 0, \quad u \geq 0, \tag{33}$$

with the initial condition $\nu(0) = 1$. To get the analytical expression of $\nu(u)$ we take the Laplace transforms of both sides of (33) for sufficiently large s ($s > \rho_1$). This yields:

$$c_1 s\hat{\nu}(s) - c_1\nu(0) = (\lambda + \delta)\hat{\nu}(s) - \lambda r \hat{f}(s)\hat{\nu}(s).$$

Since $\nu(0) = 1$,

$$(s + \frac{\lambda r}{c_1}\hat{f}(s) - \frac{\lambda + \delta}{c_1})\hat{\nu}(s) = 1. \tag{34}$$

Recalling that ρ_1 is the root of (8), we can rewrite (34) as

$$(s - \rho_1 + \frac{\lambda r}{c_1}[\hat{f}(s) - \hat{f}(\rho_1)])\hat{\nu}(s) = 1,$$

which, by dividing by $s - \rho_1$ and implementing (7), produces:

$$\hat{\nu}(s) = \frac{\lambda r}{c_1}\hat{\nu}(s) T_s T_{\rho_1} f(0) + \frac{1}{s - \rho_1}. \tag{35}$$

Inverting the Laplace transforms in (35) leads to the equation (24). Putting all pieces together in (26) completes the proof. □

6 The joint density of (τ, N_τ)

In the last section we give the joint density of the number of claims counted until ruin time and the ruin time using the Lagrange's Expansion theorem. We start with few facts that will be useful in the proof of the main result.

Recall that by $w_\infty(u,n,t)$ we denote the joint density of (τ, N_τ) for the classical risk process (1) (with infinite barrier $b=+\infty$); see (28). For $i=1,2$ we denote

$$\begin{aligned} g_i(x,0,t) &:= \delta_{x/c_i}(t)e^{-\lambda x/c_i}, \\ g_i(x,n,t) &:= xt^{n-1}e^{-\lambda t}\lambda^n f^{n*}(c_i t - x)/n!. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 6.1 *We have*

$$w_\infty(u,1,t) = \lambda e^{-\lambda t}\bar{F}(u+c_1 t).$$

For $n=1,2,3,\ldots$ the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned} w_\infty(u,n+1,t) &= \frac{(\lambda t)^n}{n!}e^{-\lambda t}\int_0^{u+c_1 t} f^{n*}(u+c_1 t-x)\lambda\bar{F}(x)dx \\ &\quad -c_1\sum_{j=1}^{n}\int_0^t \frac{(\lambda s)^j}{j!}e^{-\lambda s}f^{j*}(u+c_1 s)w_\infty(0,n+1-j,t-s))ds, \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

where

$$w_\infty(0,n,t) = \frac{\lambda}{c_1}\int_0^{c_1 t}\bar{F}(x)g_1(x,n-1,t)dx, \quad n=1,2,\ldots. \tag{37}$$

Proof. Using Lagrange's Expansion Theorem presented in Section 2 with $\alpha(z)=e^{-zx}$, $\beta(z)=-\frac{\lambda}{c_i}\hat{f}(s)$, $a=(\lambda+\delta)/c_i$ and $D=\{z||z-a|\le a\}$ $(i=1,2)$ and the Lundberg fundamental equation (8) we can conclude the following identity:

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\rho_i x} &= e^{-(\lambda+\delta)x/c_i} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{r^n}{n!}\frac{d^{n-1}}{ds^{n-1}}\left(-xe^{-sx}\left(-\frac{\lambda}{c_i}\hat{f}(s)\right)^n\right)\Big|_{s=(\lambda+\delta)/c_i} \\ &= e^{-(\lambda+\delta)x/c_i} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{r^n}{n!}\frac{d^{n-1}}{ds^{n-1}}\left((-1)^{n+1}\lambda^n x/c_i^n\int_0^\infty e^{-s(x+y)}f^{n*}(y)dy\right)\Big|_{s=(\lambda+\delta)/c_i} \\ &= e^{-(\lambda+\delta)x/c_i} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{\lambda^n r^n}{n!c_i^n}\int_0^\infty x(x+y)^{n-1}e^{-(\lambda+\delta)(x+y)/c_i}f^{n*}(y)dy. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting $t:=(x+y)/c_i$ and rearranging leads to:

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\rho_i x} &= e^{-(\lambda+\delta)x/c_i} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} r^n\frac{\lambda^n}{n!}\int_{x/c_i}^\infty xt^{n-1}e^{-\lambda t}e^{-\delta t}f^{n*}(c_i t-x)dt \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} r^n\int_{x/c_i}^\infty e^{-\delta t}g_i(x,n,t)dt. \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

Therefore,

$$T_{\rho_i}f(x) = \int_x^\infty e^{-\rho_i(u-x)}f(u)du$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \int_x^\infty \sum_{n=0}^\infty r^n \int_{(u-x)/c_i}^\infty e^{-\delta t} g_i(u-x,n,t)dt f(u)du \\
&= \sum_{n=0}^\infty r^n \int_0^\infty e^{-\delta t} \int_x^{c_i t+x} f(u) g_i(u-x,n,t)dudt. \qquad (39)
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $\phi_\infty(u)$ defined in (27) is the joint Laplace transform under the classical compound Poisson risk model without a barrier we can use Dickson [3] to complete the proof. □

Lemma 6.2 *The function $\nu(u)$ given in (24) equals*

$$
\nu(u) = \sum_{n=0}^\infty r^n \int_0^\infty e^{-\delta t} \varpi(u,n,t)dt, \qquad (40)
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
\varpi(u,0,t) &:= g_1(-u,0,t), \\
\varpi(u,n,t) &:= \sum_{m=1}^n \left(\frac{\lambda}{c_1}\right)^m \int_0^{c_1 t} \int_0^u g_{c_1}(y,n-m,t) b_m(u-x,y+x)dxdy + g_{c_1}(-u,n,t), \quad n \geq 1 \\
b_n(u,y) &:= \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \binom{n}{j} \frac{(-1)^j}{\Gamma(n)} \int_0^u (u-x)^{n-1} f^{(n-j)*}(y+u-x) f^{j*}(x)dx.
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. Our goal is to express $\nu(u)$ as the Laplace transform:

$$
\nu(u) = \int_0^\infty e^{-\rho_1 t} \xi(u,t)dt. \qquad (41)
$$

We start from definition (24):

$$
\begin{aligned}
\nu(u) &= \sum_{n=0}^\infty \left(\frac{\lambda r}{c_1}\right)^n (T_{\rho_1} f)^{n*} * p(u) \\
&= \sum_{n=1}^\infty \left(\frac{\lambda r}{c_1}\right)^n \int_0^u (T_{\rho_1} f)^{n*}(u-x) e^{\rho_1 x} dx + e^{\rho_1 u}. \qquad (42)
\end{aligned}
$$

Using Dickson and Willmot [5] we can obtain the following representation:

$$
(T_{\rho_i} f)^{n*}(u) = \int_0^\infty e^{-\rho_i y} b_n(u,y)dy \qquad (43)
$$

for

$$
b_n(u,y) := \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \binom{n}{j} \frac{(-1)^j}{\Gamma(n)} \int_0^u (u-x)^{n-1} f^{(n-j)*}(y+u-x) f^{j*}(x)dx.
$$

By (42)

$$
\begin{aligned}
\nu(u) &= \sum_{n=1}^\infty \left(\frac{\lambda r}{c_1}\right)^n \int_0^u \int_0^\infty e^{-\rho_1 y} b_n(u-x,y)dy e^{\rho_1 x} dx + e^{\rho_1 u} \\
&= \sum_{n=1}^\infty \left(\frac{\lambda r}{c_1}\right)^n \int_0^\infty e^{-\rho_1 t} \int_0^u b_n(u-x,t+x)dxdt
\end{aligned}
$$

$$+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left(\frac{\lambda r}{c_1}\right)^n\int_{-u}^{0}e^{-\rho_1 t}\int_{-t}^{u}b_n(u-x,t+x)dxdt+\int_0^{\infty}e^{-\rho_1 t}\delta_{-u}(t)dt.$$

Comparing the coefficients of $e^{-\rho_1 t}$ in (41) gives:

$$\xi(u,t)=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left(\frac{\lambda r}{c_1}\right)^n\int_0^u b_n(u-x,t+x)dx+\delta_{-u}(t). \tag{44}$$

Using (38) and (44) in (41) we end up with:

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu(u) &= \int_0^{\infty}e^{-\rho_1 y}\xi(u,y)dy+e^{\rho_1 u}\\
&= \int_0^{\infty}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}r^n\int_{y/c_1}^{\infty}e^{-\delta t}g_{c_1}(y,n,t)dt\xi(u,y)dy\\
&= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}r^n\int_0^{\infty}e^{-\delta t}\int_0^{c_1 t}g_{c_1}(y,n,t)\xi(u,y)dydt\\
&= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}r^n\int_0^{\infty}e^{-\delta t}\left(\sum_{m=1}^{n}(\frac{\lambda}{c_1})^m\int_0^{c_1 t}\int_0^u g_{c_1}(y,n-m,t)b_m(u-x,y+x)dxdy+g_{c_1}(-u,n,t)\right)dt\\
&\quad+\int_0^{\infty}e^{-\delta t}g_{c_1}(-u,0,t)dt
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. □

Using above lemmas we will prove the main result of this paper.

Theorem 6.3 *For $0\le u\le b$ and $m>1$ the joint density of the number of claims until ruin N_τ and the time to ruin τ is given by*

$$\begin{aligned}
w_1(u,1,t)&=\frac{\lambda}{c_2}e^{-\lambda t}\bar{F}(c_2t+b+\frac{c_2}{c_1}(u-b))\\
w_1(u,m,t)&=e^{-\frac{\lambda b}{c_1}}\left[\sum_{n=1}^{m}\vartheta(u,m,n,t-\frac{b}{c_1})-\sum_{n=1}^{m-1}\int_0^{t-\frac{b}{c_1}}\varsigma(b,m-n,t-\frac{b}{c_1}-z)w_1(u,n,z)dz\right],
\end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

where for $n\ge 1$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varsigma(b,0,t):=\varpi(b,0,t)=g_{c_1}(-b,0,t),\\
&\varsigma(b,n,t):=\varpi(b,n,t)-\sum_{m=0}^{n-1}\frac{\lambda}{c_2}\int_0^b\int_0^t\varpi(b-x,n-1-m,t-z)\int_x^{c_2z+x}f(y)g_2(y-x,m,z)dydzdx,\\
&\gamma(b,1,t):=\frac{\lambda}{c_2}\int_b^{c_2t+b}\bar{F}(y)g_2(y-b,0,t)dy,\\
&\gamma(b,n,t):=\sum_{m=0}^{n-2}\frac{\lambda}{c_2}\int_0^b\int_0^t w_\infty(b-x,n-m-1,t-z)\int_x^{c_2z+x}f(y)g_2(y-x,m,z)dydzdx,\\
&\vartheta(u,m,n,t):=\int_0^t\varsigma(b,m-n,t-z)w_\infty(u,n,z)+(\gamma(b,n,t-z)-w_\infty(b,n,t-z))\,\varpi(u,m-n,z)dz.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. In order to get the joint density $w(u,n,t)$, we have to take inverse Laplace transform with respect to δ rather than ρ_1 and ρ_2. To do this we must find firstly the relationship between transforms with respect to ρ_1, ρ_2 and δ by applying the Lagrange's Expansion theorem. For convenience, we will denote:

$$\chi(b) := \nu(b) - \frac{\lambda r}{c_2}\nu * T_{\rho_2} f(b). \tag{46}$$

Then we can rewrite (22) as follows:

$$\chi(b)\phi_1(u) = \chi(b)\phi_\infty(u) + \frac{\lambda r}{c_2}\left[\phi_\infty * T_{\rho_2} f(b) + T_{\rho_2}\bar{F}(b)\right]\nu(u) - \phi_\infty(b)\nu(u). \tag{47}$$

Putting (39) and (40) into (46) we will derive:

$$\begin{aligned}
\chi(b) &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} r^n \int_0^\infty e^{-\delta t}\varpi(b,n,t)dt - \frac{\lambda r}{c_2}\int_0^b \nu(b-x)T_{\rho_2}f(x)dx \\
&= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} r^n \int_0^\infty e^{-\delta t}\varpi(b,n,t)dt - \frac{\lambda r}{c_2}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} r^n \sum_{m=0}^{n}\int_0^b\int_0^\infty e^{-\delta t}\varpi(b-x,n-m,t)dt\int_0^\infty e^{-\delta z} \\
&\quad \int_x^{c_2 z+x} f(y)g_2(y-x,m,z)dydzdx \\
&= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} r^n \int_0^\infty e^{-\delta t}\varpi(b,n,t)dt - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} r^n \int_0^\infty e^{-\delta t}\{\sum_{m=0}^{n-1}\frac{\lambda}{c_2}\int_0^b\int_0^t \varpi(b-x,n-1-m,t-z) \\
&\quad \int_x^{c_2 z+x} f(y)g_2(y-x,m,z)dydzdx\}dt \\
&= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} r^n \int_0^\infty e^{-\delta t}\{\varpi(b,n,t) - \sum_{m=0}^{n-1}\frac{\lambda}{c_2}\int_0^b\int_0^t \varpi(b-x,n-1-m,t-z)\int_x^{c_2 z+x} f(y) \\
&\quad g_2(y-x,m,z)dydzdx\}dt + \int_0^\infty e^{-\delta t}\varpi(b,0,t)dt \\
&= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} r^n \int_0^\infty e^{-\delta t}\varsigma(b,n,t)dt.
\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

Similarly, using Lemma 6.1, we can check that:

$$\frac{\lambda r}{c_2}\left[\phi_\infty * T_{\rho_2} f(b) + T_{\rho_2}\bar{F}(b)\right] = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} r^n \int_0^\infty e^{-\delta t}\gamma(b,n,t)dt. \tag{49}$$

Using (40), (48) and (49) in (47) we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} r^m \int_0^\infty e^{-\delta t}\sum_{n=1}^{m}\int_0^t \varsigma(b,m-n,t-z)\left(w_1(u,n,z) - w_\infty(u,n,z)\right)dzdt \\
= &\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} r^m \int_0^\infty e^{-\delta t}\sum_{n=1}^{m}\int_0^t \left(\gamma(b,n,t-z) - w_\infty(b,n,t-z)\right)\varpi(u,m-n,z)dzdt
\end{aligned}$$

or equivalently that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{m}\int_0^t \varsigma(b,m-n,t-z)w_1(u,n,z)dz = \sum_{n=1}^{m}\int_0^t \varsigma(b,m-n,t-z)w_\infty(u,n,z)$$

$$+\left(\gamma(b,n,t-z)-w_\infty(b,n,t-z)\right)\varpi(u,m-n,z)dz.$$

Now, if $m=1$ then

$$\int_0^t \varsigma(b,0,t-z)w_1(u,1,z)dz \;=\; \vartheta(u,1,1,t).$$

In this case

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^t \delta_{-b/c_1}(t-z)e^{\frac{\lambda b}{c_1}}w_1(u,1,z)dz &= e^{\frac{\lambda b}{c_1}}w_1(u,1,t+\frac{b}{c_1})\\ &= \frac{\lambda}{c_2}e^{-\lambda t}\bar{F}(c_2t+b+\frac{c_2}{c_1}u)\end{aligned}$$

and

$$w_1(u,1,t)=\frac{\lambda}{c_2}e^{-\lambda(t+\frac{b}{c_1})}\bar{F}(c_2t+b+\frac{c_2}{c_1}(u-b)).$$

Similarly, if $m=2$ then

$$\int_0^t \delta_{-b/c_1}(t-z)e^{\frac{\lambda b}{c_1}}w_1(u,2,z)dz \;=\; \sum_{n=1}^{2}\vartheta(u,2,n,t)-\int_0^t\varsigma(b,1,t-z)w_1(u,1,z)dz$$

and

$$w_1(u,2,t)=e^{-\frac{\lambda b}{c_1}}\left[\sum_{n=1}^{2}\vartheta(u,2,n,t-\frac{b}{c_1})-\int_0^{t-\frac{b}{c_1}}\varsigma(b,1,t-\frac{b}{c_1}-z)w_1(u,1,z)dz\right].$$

Similarly we can prove the assertion for any $m>1$. □

Theorem 6.4 *For $u>b$ and $m>1$ the joint density of the number of claims until ruin N_τ and the time to ruin τ is given by*

$$w_2(u,m,t)=(\frac{\lambda}{c_2})^m\sum_{k=0}^{m-1}\sum_{n=0}^{m-k-1}\int_0^{u-b}\int_0^t\int_0^{c_2z}g_2(y,k,z)b_{m-k-n-1}(u-b-x,y)\varepsilon(x,n,t-z)dydzdx, \tag{50}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon(u,0,t) &:= \int_{u+b}^{c_2t+u+b}\bar{F}(y)g_2(y-u-b,0,t)dy,\\ \varepsilon(u,m,t) &:= \sum_{n=1}^{m}\int_u^{u+b}\int_0^t w_1(u+b-x,n,t-z)\int_x^{c_2z+x}f(y)g_2(y-x,m-n,z)dydzdx\\ &\quad+\int_{u+b}^{c_2t+u+b}\bar{F}(y)g_2(y-u-b,m,z)dy,\quad n\geq 1.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. To obtain an expression for $w_2(u,m,t)$ we first consider $h(x)$ defined in (18). Using (39) we can derive:

$$h(u) \;=\; \int_u^{u+b}\sum_{m=1}^{\infty}r^m\int_0^\infty e^{-\delta t}w_1(u+b-x,m,t)dt$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\times\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} r^n \int_0^{\infty} e^{-\delta z} \int_x^{c_2 z+x} f(y) g_2(y-x,n,z)dydzdx \\
&+\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} r^n \int_0^{\infty} e^{-\delta t} \int_{u+b}^{c_2 t+u+b} \bar{F}(y) g_2(y-u-b,n,t)dydt \\
=\ & \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} r^n \int_0^{\infty} e^{-\delta t} \Bigg[\sum_{m=1}^{n} \int_u^{u+b} \int_0^t w_1(u+b-x,m,t-z) \\
&\times \int_x^{c_2 z+x} f(y) g_2(y-x,n-m,z)dydzdx \\
&+\int_{u+b}^{c_2 t+u+b} \bar{F}(y) g_2(y-u-b,n,z)dy \Bigg] dt + \int_0^{\infty} e^{-\delta t} \int_{u+b}^{c_2 t+u+b} \bar{F}(y) g_2(y-u-b,0,t)dydt \\
=\ & \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} r^n \int_0^{\infty} e^{-\delta t} \varepsilon(u,n,t)dt. \qquad (51)
\end{aligned}
$$

Moreover, substituting (43), (51) and (38) into (17) gives:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\phi_2(u) =\ & \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\lambda r}{c_2}\right)^{m+1} \int_0^{u-b} (T_{\rho_2} f)^{m*}(u-b-x)h(x)dx \\
=\ & \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\lambda r}{c_2}\right)^{m+1} \int_0^{u-b} \int_0^{\infty} e^{-\rho_2 y} b_m(u-b-x,y)dy \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} r^n \int_0^{\infty} e^{-\delta t} \varepsilon(x,n,t)dtdx \\
=\ & \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\lambda r}{c_2}\right)^{m+1} \int_0^{u-b} \int_0^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} r^k \int_{y/c_2}^{\infty} e^{-\delta z} g_2(y,k,z)dz b_m(u-b-x,y)dy \\
&\times \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} r^n \int_0^{\infty} e^{-\delta t} \varepsilon(x,n,t)dtdx \\
=\ & \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} r^m \int_0^{\infty} e^{-\delta t} \Bigg\{ \left(\frac{\lambda}{c_2}\right)^m \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \sum_{n=0}^{m-k-1} \int_0^{u-b} \int_0^t \int_0^{c_2 z} g_2(y,k,z) b_{m-k-n-1}(u-b-x,y) \\
&\times \varepsilon(x,n,t-z)dydzdx \Bigg\} dt. \qquad (52)
\end{aligned}
$$

Comparing equations (52) and (4) completes the proof. □

Acknowledgements

This research is support by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 11171164, 11271385 and 11371020) and by the FP7 Grant PIRSES-GA-2012-318984. Zbigniew Palmowski is supported by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of Poland under the grant 2013/09/B/HS4/01496.

References

[1] A. Badescu, S. Drekic, and D. Landriault. Analysis of a threshold dividend strategy for a MAP risk model. *Scandinavian Actuarial Journal*, 2007(4):227–247, 2007.

[2] B. De Finetti. Su un'impostazione alternativa della teoria collettiva del rischio. In *Transactions of the XVth international congress of Actuaries*, pages 433–443, 1957.

[3] D. C. M. Dickson. The joint distribution of the time to ruin and the number of claims until ruin in the classical risk model. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, 50(3):334–337, 2012.

[4] D. C. M. Dickson and C. Hipp. On the time to ruin for Erlang (2) risk processes. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, 29(3):333–344, 2001.

[5] D. C. M. Dickson and G. E. Willmot. The density of the time to ruin in the classical Poisson risk model. *Astin Bulletin*, 35(1):45–60, 2005.

[6] E Frostig, S. M. Pitts, and K. Politis. The time to ruin and the number of claims until ruin for phase-type claims. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, 51(1):19–25, 2012.

[7] H. Gao and C. Yin. The perturbed Sparre Andersen model with a threshold dividend strategy. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 220(1-2):394–408, 2008.

[8] H. U. Gerber and E. S. W. Shiu. The time value of ruin in a Sparre Andersen model. *North American Actuarial Journal*, 9(2):49–69, 2005.

[9] A. E. Kyprianou and R. L. Loeffen. Refracted Lévy processes. *Annales De L' Institut Henri Poincaré Probabilités Et Statistiques*, 46(1):24–44, 2010.

[10] J. L. Lagrange. *Nouvelle méthode pour résoudre les équations littérales par le moyen des séries*. Chez Haude et Spener, Libraires de la Cour & de l'Acadmie royale, 1770.

[11] D. Landriault, T. Shi, and G. E. Willmot. Joint densities involving the time to ruin in the Sparre Andersen risk model under exponential assumptions. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, 49(3):371–379, 2011.

[12] S. Li and J. Garrido. On a class of renewal risk models with a constant dividend barrier. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, 35(3):691–701, 2004.

[13] S. Li and J. Garrido. On ruin for the Erlang (n) risk process. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, 34(3):391–408, 2004.

[14] X. S. Lin and K. P. Pavlova. The compound Poisson risk model with a threshold dividend strategy. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, 38(1):57–80, 2006.

[15] X. S. Lin, G. E. Willmot, and S. Drekic. The classical risk model with a constant dividend barrier: analysis of the Gerber-Shiu discounted penalty function. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, 33(3):551–566, 2003.

[16] Y. Lu and S. Li. The Markovian regime-switching risk model with a threshold dividend strategy. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, 44(2):296–303, 2009.

[17] G. E. Willmot and D. C. M. Dickson. The Gerber-Shiu discounted penalty function in the stationary renewal risk model. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, 32(3):403–411, 2003.

[18] C. Zhao and C. Zhang. Joint density of the number of claims until ruin and the time to ruin in the delayed renewal risk model with Erlang (n) claims. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 244:102–114, 2013.

[19] X. Zhou. On a classical risk model with a constant dividend barrier. *North American Actuarial Journal*, 9(4):95–108, 2005.

[20] J. Zhu and H. Yang. Ruin theory for a Markov regime-switching model under a threshold dividend strategy. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, 42(1):311–318, 2008.